

### REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed 26 March 2007. No fee is due for the addition of new claims. An appropriate Petition for Extension of Time to Respond is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee.

Claims 1-9, 13 and 15 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 13 and 15. The present Response adds new claims 16-20, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-9, 13 and 15-20. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

#### I. THE REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bulthuis (US 6,768,842). The Examiner also rejected claims 2-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bulthuis (US 6,768,842) in view of Bouda (US 6,643,432), and further in view of Laurent-Lund (US 2005/0207705). The Examiner also rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over a combination of Bulthuis, Bouda, Laurent-Lund, and Li (US 5,745,619).

Thus all of the rejections rely at least in part on Bulthuis.

However, pursuant to 35 USC 103(c)(1), Bulthuis is **not prior art** for purposes of a rejection under 35 USC 103(a), since at the time the invention of the present patent application was made, both the invention of the present application and the Bulthuis patent (then still a Great Britain priority application) were owned by, or were both subject to an obligation of assignment to, the same person. See MPEP 8 rev. 5 section 706.02(I)(2)(I and II).

A Statement of Common Ownership is set forth below.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that all of the rejected claims should be patentable.

#### II. STATEMENT OF COMMON OWNERSHIP

Applicants hereby state that at the time the invention of the present patent application was made, both the invention of the present application and the Bulthuis patent (then still a Great

Britain priority application) were owned by, or were both subject to an obligation of assignment to, the same person.

### **III. OTHER MATTERS AND CONCLUSION**

New claims 16-20 include a contribution by a previously unnamed inventor, Harm Van Weerden. A Request to Correct Inventorship, with associated papers, is being submitted herewith.

The references cited by the Examiner but not relied upon have been reviewed, but are not believed to render the claims unpatentable, either singly or in combination.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including 26 September 2007.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50 0869 (GEML 4793-3) for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Dated: September 26, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Warren S. Wolfeld/  
Warren S. Wolfeld  
Registration No.: 31,454  
HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP  
P.O. Box 366  
637 Main Street  
Half Moon Bay, California 94019  
(650) 712-0340  
Attorney for Applicant